

<b>PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW</b>		Docket Number (Optional)  12000.SMG.0008	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]  on _____  Signature _____  Typed or printed name _____		Application Number  10/782,193	Filed  February 19, 2004
		First Named Inventor  Hyo-Sun HWANG et al.	
		Art Unit  2476	Examiner  Mounir MOUTAOUAKIL
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.          This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.          The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.          I am the  <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"><div style="width: 45%;"><input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.  <input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>54,266</u>  <input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____</div><div style="width: 50%; border-top: 1px solid black; padding-top: 5px;"><u>/Rachael Lea Leventhal/</u> Signature <u>Rachael Lea Leventhal</u> Typed or printed name  <u>202-429-0020</u> Telephone number  <u>July 16, 2010</u> Date</div></div> <div style="font-size: small;">NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</div>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>1</u> forms are submitted.			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

*If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.*

## Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**APPLICANTS:** Hyo-Sun HWANG et al.

**CONFIRMATION NO.:** 4103

**APPLICATION NO.:** 10/782,193

**GROUP ART UNIT:** 2476

**FILING DATE:** February 19, 2004

**EXAMINER:** Mounir MOUTAOUAKIL

**TITLE:** Apparatus and method for transmitting packets in a communication system

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Mail Stop: AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Advisory Action dated June 28, 2010, reconsideration and allowance of Applicants' claims are respectfully requested in view of Applicants' amendments and remarks provided below. Applicants respectfully request review of the rejections of the Final Office Action dated April 23, 2010, prior to appeal. Applicants make this request because the Final Office Action has failed to identify the omission or presence of essential elements required to establish a *prima facie* rejection. The Advisory Action indicated that the amendments made in the Amendment After Final filed June 17, 2010, would be entered for the purposes of appeal.

**Failure to identify essential elements in rejection of claims 6, 9-11, 14-15, 20, and 24-27**

Claims 6, 9-11, 14-15, 20, and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ketcham (US 6,721,334) in view of O'Mahony et al. (US 2004/0018016).

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Neither Ketcham nor O'Mahony et al., even when considered in combination, teaches or suggests all of the features of independent claims 6, 11, 20, or 26-27.

Claim 6 recites an apparatus for generating an aggregation packet in a communication system comprising, *inter alia*, “a buffer manager configured to store a plurality of data packets; and an aggregation module configured to receive the plurality of data packets from the buffer manager” (emphasis added). Claims 11, 20, and 26-27 recite similar features. Applicants respectfully submit that Ketcham and O'Mahony et al., even when combined, fail to teach or suggest at least these features.

To the contrary, Ketcham teaches only the routers 308 and 312 which receive individual packets and then perform the aggregation. There is no buffer that stores a plurality packets and a separate aggregation module that receives the plurality of packets. In fact, Ketcham teaches against using the separately claimed elements, as the routers 308 and 312 include a timeout function such that “[i]f the timer expires before any packets with a shared LLC destination are received, then the packet 118 is transmitted without being aggregated.” Col. 7, ln. 49-52. Applicants note that the Office Action asserts that the routers 308 and 312 are each both the buffer and the aggregation module, but there is no feedback such that the routers receive the packets from themselves. Applicants respectfully submit that Ketcham does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least a buffer manager that stores a plurality of data packets, **and an aggregation module** that receives the plurality of data packets from the buffer manager, as recited in claims 6, 11, 20, and 26-27. Nor is O'Mahony et al. cited for these features. Thus, O'Mahony et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Ketcham.

Moreover, claim 6 further recites “aggregating at least two data packets comprising a same destination address and identical quality of service information” (emphasis added). Claims 11, 20, and 26-27 recite similar features. To the contrary, O’Mahony et al., which was cited for teaching that the data packets comprise identical quality of service information, actually teaches that “the input packets are aggregated based on destination and Quality of Service (QoS) parameters” and “optical packets with two destinations with two QoS classes.” ¶ [0040] (emphasis added). This change in terminology, from “parameters” to “classes” implies that there is a difference between the terms. ¶ [0038] of O’Mahony further teaches that the “LSRs 11 and the OPSs 10 handle the same granularity (per packet)” (emphasis added). This further bolsters the position that the classes of QoS may contain multiple different actual QoS values. Applicants respectfully submit that O’Mahony et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “aggregating at least two data packets comprising a same destination address and identical quality of service information,” as recited in claims 6, 11, 20, and 26-27. The Office Action admits at page 4 that Ketcham fails to teach these features. Thus, Ketcham does not remedy the deficiencies of O’Mahony et al.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that O’Mahony et al. is invalid to the extent that the figures, which are cited in the Office Action, are not fully described in or understandable from the specification. For example, there is no labeling or description of the various shading types in FIG. 3, and there are may reference characters (e.g., S1-S5, op1-op3, and OTN1-OTN2) which are not described in the specification in violation of 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). “Reference characters not mentioned in the description shall not appear in the drawings.” *Id.*

Applicants further incorporate the arguments made in the response filed February 2, 2010. Applicants submit that the OTN of O'Mahony et al. only supports continuous data streams, and offers granularity only at the wavelength level. ¶ [0002]. Ketcham teaches against continuous data streams, for example, "packet 118 ... is being held for possible aggregation. ... Until the timer expires or the payload of the aggregate packet is full, additional packets can be put into the aggregate packet." Col. 7, ln. 45-49. In other words, Ketcham teaches holding packets for a predetermined period of time, which directly contradicts the continuous data streams of O'Mahony et al.

In the "Response to Arguments" section, the Office Action alleges that "the packets are aggregated based on destination and QoS parameters" of O'Mahony, which means that they have to be the "same destination and same QoS." However, Applicants respectfully submit that this allegation has no foundation. Specifically, the phrase "based on destination and QoS parameters" may have various meanings, such as that the corresponded parameters are same with a threshold value, that the corresponded parameters are within the determined scope, and that the corresponded parameters coincide with the previously determined standard. Accordingly, Applicants do not believe that the meaning of "same" is necessarily inferred by the phrase, "based on."

Since Ketcham and O'Mahony et al. are not properly combinable and do not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 6, 11, 20, and 26-27, claims 6, 11, 20, and 26-27 are not obvious over the cited combination. Claims 9-10, 14-15, and 24-25 depend, respectively, from independent claims 6, 11, and 20, and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above,

and on their own merits. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 6, 9-11, 14-15, 20, and 24-27 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

**Failure to identify essential elements in rejection of claims 8, 13, and 23**

Claims 8, 13, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ketcham in view of O'Mahony et al., and further in view of alleged admitted prior art (AAPA). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 8, 13, and 23 depend, respectively, from independent claims 6, 11, and 20, and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above, and on their own merits. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 8, 13, and 23 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

It is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 16, 2010

By: /Rachael Lea Leventhal/  
Rachael Lea Leventhal  
Reg. No. 54,266  
NSIP Law  
1156 15th Street NW, Suite 603  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: (202) 429-0020

RLL/